

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 29 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections.

Respectfully, the rejection is an omnibus rejection of the claims without particularly addressing individual claims. The Examiner has suggested that the relationship between "window ID" and "panel ID" is unclear, however these limitations do not appear each of claims 1-29. Further, the limitations "window ID" and "panel ID" as claimed are believed to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to ascertain the invention. For example, claim 11 claims, *inter alia*, "the window ID to be processed by the unit comprising at least one panel having the panel ID set by the panel ID setting means." Similarly, claims 1 and 7 claim, *inter alia*, "a control signal output section for outputting a control signal to set said window ID to be processed by said unit having said panel ID". Thus, the relationship between a window ID and a panel ID, where found in the claims, is believed to satisfy the requirements of 35U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Accordingly, claims 1-29 are believed to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Porter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,889,945) in view of Tahara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,031,631).

The Examiner stated essentially that combined teachings of Porter and Tahara teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 1-29. The independent claims are claims 1, 7, 11, 14, 18, 20, and 25.

Claims 1 and 7 claim, *inter alia*, “a window ID allocation section for allocating a window ID for a window constituting a unit for transferring an image signal; a control signal output section for outputting a control signal for setting said window ID to be processed by said unit having said panel ID” and “a window ID allocation section for allocating a window ID for a window constituting a unit for transferring said image signal; a control signal output section for outputting a control signal to set said window ID to be processed by said unit having said panel ID”, respectively. Claim 11 claims, *inter alia*, “receiving means for receiving said window ID added to the image signal, wherein the unit comprising at least one panel processes the window, based on the correspondence relation of said panel ID and said window ID.” Claim 14 claims, *inter alia*, “receiving means for receiving said window ID added to the image signal, wherein the at least one predetermined number of sub-panels processes the window, based on the correspondence relation of said panel ID and said window ID.” Claim 18 claims, *inter alia*, “the plurality of panels in said display have a panel ID as an identifier, wherein said host system allocates a window ID for a window in an image space.” Claim 20 claims, *inter alia*, “prior to a transfer of image information, setting a window ID to be processed for said display section for which said panel ID is set.” Claim 25 claims, *inter alia*, “reading out attribute information of a specified display panel by said host system.”

It is impermissible for the Examining attorney to use hindsight in choosing citations which, when grouped together, appear to anticipate the application. Multiple cited prior art references must suggest the desirability of being combined, and the references must be viewed without the benefit of hindsight afforded by the disclosure. The Examiner has chosen a

multitude of references, apparently in hindsight, to reject claims 1 to 29, however, each reference relates to an entirely different art. For example, Porter teaches video conferencing methods. Tahara teaches methods for controlling a plurality of digital copiers. Given the different fields of the references (Porter's video conferencing and Tahara's digital copying), and the lack of a suggestion or motivation to combine the references, these references are not believed to be combinable. Even when viewed together, the cited references do not render the Applicant's invention obvious. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

At least claims 1, 7, 11, 14, 18, 20, and 25 are believed to be allowable for additional reasons.

Referring to claims 1 and 7, Porter teaches a method and apparatus for associating user information with conference participants in a conferencing environment (see col. 2 line 64 to Col. 3 line 8). Porter does not teach or suggest "setting said window ID to be processed by said unit having said panel ID" as claimed in claim 1 and essentially as claimed in claim 7. Porter teaches an attendee bar with a file transfer parent window, wherein the attendee bar includes multiple panels (see col. 10, lines 12-16 and Figure 6a). Porter's panels and windows are wholly unrelated to the claimed subject matter. For example, Porter's windows are graphical user interface (GUI) windows, and have no relevance to "a window constituting a unit for transferring an image signal" as claimed in claims 1 and 7. Further, a panel according to Porter is not a display panel for displaying said portion of the image space, as claimed in claims 1 and 7. Porter's panels are mere GUI elements within a GUI window (see Figure 6a). Further, these windows and panels do not have corresponding identifications, e.g., a window ID and a panel ID. Accordingly, Porter does not teach or suggest that a window ID is set to be processed by a unit having a panel ID, essentially as

claimed in claims 1 and 7. Accordingly, Porter fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 1 and 7.

Tahara teaches an image processing system with independent control of image forming apparatus (i.e., printers or digital copiers) (see abstract). Tahara further teaches an imaging processing unit (IPU) for connecting the image forming apparatus to a computer (see col. 25, lines 49 to 51). Tahara does not teach or suggest “setting said window ID to be processed by said unit having said panel ID” as claimed in claim 1 and essentially as claimed in claim 7. Tahara teaches methods for high speed printing using multiple digital copiers (see Figure 20A). None of the digital copiers, the IPU, or the computer of Tahara sets a window ID to be processed by a unit having a panel ID, essentially as claimed in claims 1 and 7. Tahara does not teach a window ID and a panel ID, much less, “setting said window ID to be processed by said unit having said panel ID” as claimed in claim 1 and essentially as claimed in claim 7. Therefore, Tahara fails to cure the deficiencies of Porter. Claims 1 and 7 are believed to be allowable over the combined teachings of Porter and Tahara.

Claims 11, 14, 18, and 20 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claims 1 and 7, wherein claims 11 and 14 claim, *inter alia*, “the correspondence relation of said panel ID and said window ID”; claim 18 claims, *inter alia*, “the plurality of panels in said display have a panel ID as an identifier, wherein said host system allocates a window ID for a window in an image space”; and claim 20 claims, *inter alia*, “prior to a transfer of image information, setting a window ID to be processed for said display section for which said panel ID is set” (Emphasis added).

Porter teaches an end point displays conferencing information (see col. 5, lines 6 to 11). The display of Porter does not have an ID. Porter does not teach or suggest a panel ID

or a window ID, as claimed in claims 11, 14, 18, and 20. As shown with respect to claims 1 and 7, Porter's panels and windows are unrelated to the claimed subject matter. Porter's panels are mere GUI elements within a GUI window (see Figure 6a). Neither the panels nor the windows having an identification. Therefore, Porter fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 11, 14, 18, and 20.

Tahara teaches a system and method for printing document on multiple printers, each having an address (see col. 1, lines 64 to 67). Tahara does not teach or suggest a panel ID or a window ID, as claimed in claims 11, 14, 18, and 20. None of the printers, the IPU, or the computer of Tahara have a window ID or a panel ID. Therefore, Tahara fails to cure the deficiencies of Porter. Therefore, Tahara fails to cure the deficiencies of Porter. The combined teachings of the Porter and Tahara fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 11, 14, 18, and 20.

Referring now to claim 25, Porter does not teach or suggest, "reading out attribute information of a specified display panel by said host system." Porter teaches that each end point, e.g., a conference participant, is responsible for managing its own display of information (col. 5, lines 6 to 11). Thus, no attribute information of an end point is known to other participants or host systems in the conference. There is no information about an end point display read out from any conference participant. Porter does not teach or suggest, "reading out attribute information of a specified display panel by said host system." Therefore, Porter fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 25.

Similarly, Tahara does not teach or suggest, "reading out attribute information of a specified display panel by said host system." Tahara teaches a printers and digital copiers. Tahara does not teach or suggest panels, much less, "reading out attribute information of a

specified display panel by said host system” as claimed in claim 25 (Emphasis added).

Therefore, Tahara fail to cure the deficiencies of Porter. The combined teachings of Porter and Tahara fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 25.

Claims 2 to 6 depend from claim 1. Claims 8 to 10 depend from claim 7. Claims 12 and 13 depend from claim 11. Claims 15 to 17 depend from claim 14. Claim 19 depends from claim 18. Claims 21 to 24 depend from claim 20. Claims 26 to 29 depend from claim 25. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for the independent claims. At least claims 5 and 9 are believed to be allowable for additional reasons.

Claims 5 and 9 claim “wherein said image signal transfer section manages an update of a screen for each window, packetizes an updated image signal when the update is needed, and adds said window ID to said image signal...”

Porter teaches a system and method for conferencing comprising the exchange of information between end points, wherein the end points control display functions (see col. 5, lines 6 to 11). Porter does not teach or suggest a “wherein said image signal transfer section manages an update of a screen for each window, packetizes an updated image signal when the update is needed, and adds said window ID to said image signal...” as claimed in claims 5 and 9. Therefore, Porter fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 5 and 9.

Tahara teaches a plurality of image forming apparatus each having an address. Tahara does not teach or suggest a “wherein said image signal transfer section manages an update of a screen for each window, packetizes an updated image signal when the update is needed, and adds said window ID to said image signal...” as claimed in claims 5 and 9. An image forming apparatus, i.e., a printer or digital copier, does not update a screen. Tahara teaches printing methods. There is no teaching of any updating of printed job. Therefore,

Tahara fail to cure the deficiencies of Porter. The combined teachings of Porter and Tahara fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 5 and 9.

Accordingly, the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including claims 1 to 29 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Nathaniel T. Wallace

Reg. No. 48,909

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Mailing Address:
F. Chau & Associates, LLP
1900 Hempstead Turnpike
Suite 501
East Meadow, NY 11554
TEL: (516) 357-0091
FAX: (516) 357-0092